

Sarah Valentine

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 March 2026 20:55
To: planninginfo
Subject: Application Reference: DM/26/0328

[REDACTED]

Letter of Objection to Planning Application

To: Mid Sussex District Council Planning Department

Re: Objection to Planning Application – Proposed Installation of 17.5m Monopole Supporting 6 Antennas, 2 No. 300mm Transmission Dishes, 3 No. Equipment Cabinets, 3 No. Remote Radio Heads (RRHs) and Ancillary Development, Burgess Hill**

Date: 18th March 2026

Application Reference: DM/26/0328

Dear Planning Officer,

I write to formally object to the above-referenced planning application in the strongest possible terms. I ask that this objection be registered and given full consideration by the Planning Committee prior to any decision being made. My objections are detailed below and encompass concerns relating to the safety of vulnerable members of our community, the visual and environmental impact upon the local area, non-compliance with national and local planning policy, and outstanding concerns regarding the health implications of this technology.

The proposed mast would be situated within **250 metres** of a local primary school and a **Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) college**. These facilities serve some of the most vulnerable members of our community — young children and individuals with complex needs — who spend significant portions of their day in close proximity to the proposed site. Furthermore, **three public parks** lie within this same 250-metre radius, with the closest located only approximately **100 metres** from the proposed installation.

As acknowledged within the application's own supporting documentation, **the health impacts of 5G remain unclear**. This is a technology still in relative infancy, and long-term exposure studies — particularly those examining the effects on children and individuals with pre-existing vulnerabilities — are limited in both scope and duration.

The **precautionary principle**, which is a well-established concept in both environmental and public health law, requires that where scientific uncertainty exists, protective action should be taken rather than waiting for harm to be proven conclusively. Siting this infrastructure within 100 metres of a park regularly used by children and within 250 metres of a primary school and SEND college, in the absence of conclusive safety evidence, is inconsistent with the NPPF's requirement that planning decisions create **healthy and safe places**.

I urge the Local Planning Authority to apply appropriate weight to this concern, particularly given the vulnerable populations in the immediate vicinity of the proposed installation.

The proposed monopole stands at **17.5 metres** in height. The surrounding built environment is characterised predominantly by **two-storey residential dwellings**, typically no greater than 8 to 9 metres in height. The proposed mast is therefore approximately **twice the height** of the surrounding properties, creating severe and unjustifiable vertical discordance with the established street scene.

This creates an oppressive and dominant structure that would loom over neighbouring homes and gardens, resulting in a significant and unacceptable loss of visual amenity for residents. The industrial character of the equipment — comprising six antennas, transmission dishes, and ground-level cabinets — is entirely at odds with the domestic residential environment in which it is proposed to sit.

The application site sits at a **topographical low point** within Burgess Hill. Rather than mitigating the visual impact of the mast, this location actively exacerbates it. The reduced ground elevation means the structure must achieve a yet **greater effective height** above the surrounding area in order to fulfil its operational purpose, resulting in the mast dramatically and unnecessarily **breaking the local skyline**.

This is not simply an unfortunate consequence of the site selection — it is evidence of a **failure to adequately explore alternative, more appropriate locations** as required by policy. A site where the mast could be better screened or integrated, would reduce skyline intrusion and visual harm considerably.

This application is contrary to a range of established national and local planning policies, as confirmed by the formal recommendation of **Burgess Hill Town Council**, whose Planning Committee, meeting on **9th March**, voted to **recommend refusal** of this application.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2024)

Chapters 8, 10, 11 and 12 of the NPPF 2024 collectively require that planning decisions:

- Create **healthy, safe and visually attractive places** with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users;
- Support high-quality digital communications infrastructure whilst keeping the number of masts and sites to a **minimum**;
- Ensure masts are **sympathetically designed** and located;
- Require applicants to demonstrate that they have **explored the possibility of sharing existing infrastructure** or utilising existing buildings and masts before proposing a new standalone structure;
- Require applicants to **justify the chosen site** and demonstrate it is the most appropriate available option.

The erection of a new 17.5-metre monopole in this sensitive residential location fails to meet these requirements and cannot be supported.

Mid Sussex District Plan

Policy DP26 – Character and Design requires development to respect and enhance the character of the surrounding area. The proposed mast is materially out of scale with the surrounding two-storey homes and domestic gardens, creating a dominant and visually obtrusive structure that is oppressive in character and overshadows several nearby residential properties. This application is directly contrary to this policy.

Policy DP23 – Communication Infrastructure explicitly requires that the location and appearance of telecommunications infrastructure is chosen and designed so as to **minimise visual impact**. The selection of a topographically low site for a 17.5-metre mast in a residential area fails this test.

Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD

The application is also contrary to the following guidance within the Mid Sussex Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document:

- **DG39 – Deliver Appropriately Scaled Buildings** – The mast fails to respect street enclosure and frontage proportions appropriate to the local context;
- **DG13 – Provide Positive Frontage to Streets** – The installation of industrial telecommunications equipment and ground-level cabinets presents a negative, utilitarian frontage entirely inconsistent with the well-established residential street scene;
- **DG14 – Provide Enclosure** – The proposed development disrupts the sense of enclosure and human scale that defines the existing streetscape;
- **DG17 – Provide Attractive Streets and Spaces** – Rather than contributing to attractive, pedestrian-friendly streets, the mast would introduce a visually dominant and unwelcoming industrial feature into what is currently a pleasant residential environment.

Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan

The application is contrary to the **Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan's** design, character and amenity policies. The installation would **adversely affect the visual outlook** of multiple residential properties and undermine the quality of place that the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to protect and enhance. The Neighbourhood Plan reflects the direct and democratically expressed wishes of the Burgess Hill community, and its policies must be given significant weight in the determination of this application.

As noted above, **NPPF Chapter 10** places a clear and unambiguous expectation on applicants that:

- The number of masts and sites is kept to a **minimum**;
- Applicants have **fully explored the use of existing structures**, including existing masts and buildings, before proposing new installations;
- The **chosen site is fully justified** as the most appropriate available option.

The application documentation does not, in my view, adequately discharge this burden. The selection of a topographically disadvantaged residential location — when alternatives may well exist — strongly suggests that site selection has been insufficiently rigorous. I respectfully request that the Planning Officer and Committee satisfy themselves that this obligation has been fully met before any grant of consent is considered.

For the reasons set out above, I respectfully but firmly urge Mid Sussex District Council to **refuse this planning application**. In summary, the proposed development:

- Is located **unacceptably close** to a primary school, SEND college and multiple parks, posing an unacceptable risk to children and vulnerable individuals;
- Is **grossly out of scale** with the surrounding residential built environment and would cause severe harm to visual amenity;

- Is sited at a **topographical low point**, dramatically exacerbating its impact on the skyline and demonstrating a failure to explore more appropriate locations;
- Is **contrary to NPPF 2024** Chapters 8, 10, 11 and 12;
- Is **contrary to Mid Sussex District Plan** Policies DP26 and DP23;
- Is **contrary to Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD** policies DG13, DG14, DG17 and DG39;
- Is **contrary to the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan's** design, character and amenity policies;
- Raises **unresolved health and safety concerns** in the context of a vulnerable community.

I respectfully request that this objection is acknowledged, formally recorded and given full weight in the determination of this application.

Yours faithfully,

